REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated June 16, 2005. Claims 1-6 are pending in the patent application. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable by Chambers et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,959,536 ("Chambers"). At least for the reasons set forth below, Applicant believes that the rejections raised in the Office Action have been overcome and thus should be withdrawn.

Prompt and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Claim 1 relates to an information signal device connected to a network. The information signal device includes a broadcast manager for broadcasting generated messages having unspecified destinations to the network as directed by the event manager. The broadcast manager broadcasts each message with reference information attached thereto, and the reference information changes at each message broadcast according to a predetermined sequence.

Chambers relates to a control system for networked consumer electronics devices. However, Chambers does not disclose that a broadcast manager broadcasts each message with reference information attached thereto, wherein the reference information changes at each broadcast according to a predetermined sequence as described in Claim 1. Chambers describes stamping command messages with a system-wide unique sequence ID. Col. 10, Lines 4-8. However, Chambers only describes stamping error or event messages with a system-wide unique sequence ID if they are generated as a result of a command message; and then, the error or event messages are stamped with the same system-wide unique sequence ID as that command rather than their own system-wide unique sequence ID. Col. 10, Lines 4-8. Further, Chambers teaches that event messages are broadcast. Col. 10, Lines 31-33. Thus, not every broadcasted message in Chambers is broadcast with reference information attached thereto, wherein the reference information changes at each message broadcast according to a predetermined sequence.

Further, Claim 5 relates to an information signal device connected to a network wherein the broadcast manager deletes a held message the moment at which a duration longer than twice a predetermined repetition period elapses. Chambers discloses placing messages on an internal queue, then removing the messages from the queue for delivery. Col. 9, Lines 5-15. However, Chambers does not teach that the messages are deleted from the queue when twice a predetermined time lapses. Instead, Chambers teaches removing the messages from the queue

when it is to be delivered. Chambers does not teach that the time that lapses before a message is ready for delivery, and is thus removed from the queue, is predetermined in any way.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 and Claims 2, 4 and 5, which depend from Claim 1, are each patentably distinguished over Chambers and are in condition for allowance.

Claim 3 relates to an information signal device connected to a network. The information signal device includes a broadcast manager for broadcasting generated messages having unspecified destinations to the network. The broadcast manager also receives broadcasted messages from the network, and recognizes a change in reference information attached to a broadcasted message received from the network. The reference information changes at each message broadcast according to a predetermined sequence. The broadcast manager also requests that a sender of the broadcasted message retransmit the broadcasted message in response to a result of the recognition.

Chambers discloses that "an error message is broadcast to anyone with an interest." Col. 9, Lines 37-38. Further, Chambers describes stamping command messages with a system-wide unique sequence ID. Col. 10, Lines 4-8. However, Chambers does not disclose a broadcast manager recognizing a change in reference information attached to a broadcasted message and requesting a sender of the broadcasted message retransmit the broadcasted message in response to the recognition. As discussed above, Chambers only describes stamping error or event messages with a system-wide unique sequence ID if they are generated as a result of a command message; and then, the error or event messages are stamped with the same system-wide unique sequence ID as that command rather than their own system-wide unique sequence ID. Col. 10, Lines 4-8. Thus, the system-wide unique sequence ID of Chambers is used to identify error and event messages sent in response to a command message. However, Chambers does not suggest that a broadcast manager requests a retransmission of any message as a result of recognizing a change in the system-wide unique sequence ID.

Further, Claim 6 relates to an information signal device connected to a network wherein the broadcast manager receives verification information transmitted to the network and requests that a device, which has transmitted the verification information, transmit the broadcasted message if the received verification information does not include an expected next value in the predetermined sequence.

Chambers describes broadcasting a message periodically to invite new nodes to respond. Col. 11, Lines 56-57. However, even if each such invitation were a command message stamped with a system-wide unique sequence ID, Chambers does not disclose a broadcast manager that requests that a device transmit the broadcasted message if the system-wide unique sequence ID does not include an expected next value in a predetermined sequence.

For at least these reasons, Claim 3 and Claim 6, which depends from Claim 3, are each patentably distinguished over Chambers and are in condition for allowance.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-6 are patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BY _____
Thomas C. Basso (46,541)
Cust. No. 29175

Dated: September 12, 2005